

REMARKS

The specification is amended on page 1 to insert the serial number of the related application. No new matter is entered. This amendment overcomes the Examiners objection.

Claims 1 - 6 and 20 are cancelled without prejudice.

Independent claims 7 and 16 are amended above to require the provided file (mailfile) to be stored on a server. Support is found in applicants' specification page 2, lines 15 - 16, page 6, lines 18 - 20, and FIG. 1. Claims 7 and 16 are also amended to require the requesting application to be running on a user workstation different from said server. Support is found on page 1, lines 17 - 18 and in FIG. 1. Claim 16 is amended to add web service software for performing inserting, retrieving, and removing functions as also required in claim 7 as originally filed. Claims 7 and 16 are amended to require those functions/steps be performed at said server. Support is found on page 7, line 15 - page 8, line 10, and FIG. 1 where MACS is clearly shown as running on the DOMINO server and application 18 is not on DOMINO server. No new matter is entered.

Claims 16 - 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Benninghoff (U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0091782) in view of Don Box (Simple Object Access Protocol

END920030038US1

10/603,999

(SOAP) 1.1 standard). Likewise, claims 7 - 10, and 12 - 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Benninghoff and Don Box and further in view of Grout (US 5,913,033). Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Benninghoff, Don Box and Grout and further in view of Little (U.S. Patent Publication 2005/0114671).

However, independent claims 7 and 16 as amended above are now allowable over Benninghoff in view of Grout. Specifically, as noted by the Examiner, Benninghoff does not disclose, for example, the three steps in claim 7 of inserting a URL into said markup language document to retrieve said section of said one of said documents;

retrieving said section from said mailfile in said markup language;

removing said URL from the retrieval document and creating an object having said section expanded in the retrieval document. These three steps must all be performed at the server. Claim 7 as amended above also then requires that the object be sent to the application, which is running on a server workstation different from the server.

In contrast, Grout in column 3, lines 13 - 32, describes a document manager running a client computer retrieving documents, downloaded from a server computer, which contain embedded links

END920030038US1

10/603,999

to objects. The client computer keeps a local copy of the objects. Network traffic is therefore reduced because the client needs to retrieve fewer linked objects from the server. Grout also does not describe in the above cited column 3, lines 13 - 32, nor in FIG. 2A or in column 5, lines 45 - 61, applicants' requirement of claim 1 of removing at said server said URL from the retrieved document and creating an object having said section expanded in the retrieved document. Grout does not appear to describe removing said URL at all. Note that all of the actions in Grout are described as being performed at the client computer and not at the server as required by applicants' amended independent claims 7 and 16.

Applicants' independent claims are therefore allowable over Benninghoff in view of Grout since neither describes these three important steps. Don Box and Little also do not describe these steps. All of the remaining claims 8 - 15, and 17 - 19 are dependent directly or indirectly on allowable claims 7 or 16 and are therefore also allowable. Allowance of all the pending claims is respectfully requested.

The Application is deemed in condition for allowance and such action by the Examiner is urged. Should differences remain, however, which do not place one/more of the remaining claims in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned at the number provided below for the purpose of providing constructive assistance and suggestions in

END920030038US1

10/603,999

accordance with M.P.E.P. Sections 707, 707.07(d) and 707.07(j) in order that allowable claims can be presented, thereby placing the application in condition for allowance without further proceedings being necessary.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 03/13/06

By: John R. Pivnichny
John R. Pivnichny
Reg. No. 43,001

Telephone: (607) 429-4358

Fax: (607) 429-4119

END920030038US1

10/603,999